UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,606	12/22/2003	Gary Douglas Chapman	GB920020080US1	7562

23550   7590   11/02/2007

HOFFMAN WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO, LLC
75 STATE STREET
14TH FLOOR
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER
PANTOLIANO JR, RICHARD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _15 August 2007_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under _Ex parte Quayle_, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-15_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-15_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This Office Action is filed in response to amendments filed on **15 August 2007**

for Application# **10/743, 606**. **Claims 1, 7, 14, 15** were amended. **Claims 1-15** are

currently pending and have been considered below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   **Claims 1-15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over <u>Hennum et al</u>

(US Pat: 6,259,445), hereafter <u>Hennum</u>, in view of <u>Cooper</u> (US Pat: 6,871,348).

4.   As per **Claim 1**, <u>Hennum</u> discloses the invention substantially as claimed

including a method for generating a tutorial application linked to one or more source

code elements, the method comprising the steps of:

        a) receiving user input indicating one or more source code elements to be

selected and one or more data elements to be tagged to one or more selected source

code elements *(Col 11, Lines 6-25 and Col 12, Lines 20-35)*;

        b) tagging one or more selected source code elements with one or more of the

data elements *(Col 12, Lines 7 – 12)*;

c) generating the tutorial application linked to one or more source code files from said tagged source code elements *(Col 11, Lines 6-11)*;

d) displaying the generated tutorial application, the tagged source code elements and the data elements in a display interface *(Col 12, Lines 27-34)*,

e) wherein the display interface simultaneously displays (Figs. 7-16 and Col. 3, lines 1-18) (Windows are displayed both adjacent to one another, as well as overlapping, allowing content to be shown simultaneously. Further, since Hennum identifies Figs. 7-16 as screen shots of the running application, the application windows must be on the same screen, thereby meeting this claim limitation):

i) a list of tutorial steps contained within the application (Col. 9, lines 10-36) (The steps of the example code associated with the user-selected example are displayed to the user);

ii) a source code window containing a source code element associated with a selected one of the tutorial steps of the list of tutorial steps (Col. 9, lines 10-36) (This window is updated to show the portion of source code being executed at the current step of the example being executed); and

iii) an explanation window containing the one or more data elements associated with the source code element displayed in the code window (Col. 9, lines 10-36).

5.   Hennum does not explicitly teach wherein each of the windows are integrated as separate segments within a single window and wherein the generated tutorial application is self-contained.

6.   Cooper explicitly teaches wherein each of a group of windows are integrated as separate segments within a single window and wherein the generated tutorial application is self-contained (Cooper: col. 1, line 65 – col. 2, line 3; col. 2, lines 55 –67; and col. 3, lines 1-25) (Each window of one or more applications is attached to a "shell application" which groups all of the windows into the window of the shell, thereby meeting the claim limitation).

7.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method disclosed by Hennum with the teachings of Cooper because of the improvement in usability of displaying multiple pieces of related information within a uniform user interface (Cooper: col. 1, line 65 – col. 2, line 3 and col. 2, lines 55 –67).

8.   As per **Claim 2**, Hennum further teaches wherein the selected source code elements are tagged by a markup language *(Col 12, Lines 7-12)*.

9.   As per **Claim 3**, Hennum further teaches wherein support for one or more programming languages is provided *(Col 5, Lines 60-67)*.

10.   As per **Claim 4,** Hennum further teaches wherein support for one or more execution environments is provided *(Col 5, Lines 50-59)*.

11.   As per **Claim 5**, <u>Hennum</u> further teaches wherein receiving user input further

comprises creating one or more tutorial steps *(Col 4, Lines 46-59 and Col 11, Lines 6-*

11) (The "annotations" meet this claim limitation).

12.   As per **Claim 6**, <u>Hennum</u> further teaches wherein the data elements comprise an

explanation text for the selected source code elements *(Col 4, Lines 46-59 and Col 11,*

Lines 6-11) (The "annotations" meet this claim limitation).

13.   As per **Claims 7-12**, being directed to the system implementing the method of

Claims 1-6, respectively, these claims are rejected for the same reasons as **Claims 1-6**

above.

14.   As per **Claim 13**, being the computer program product loaded into the internal

memory of a computer with instructions for implementing the method of **Claim 1**, it is

rejected for the same reasons as **Claim 1** above.

15.   As per **Claim 14**, this claim is rejected for the same reasons as **Claim 1** above.

16.   As per **Claim 15**, this claim is rejected for the same reasons as **Claim 7** above.

Response to Arguments

17.   Applicant's arguments with respect to **Claims 1-15** have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

18.   Examiner notes that Applicant's arguments state that <u>Hennum</u> teaches away

from utilizing a "self contained" application (see page 8 of response filed **15 August**

2007). However, Applicant's disclosure provides no explicit definition of the term and, at

best, alludes to the term "self contained" as meaning that all of the information being

displayed is displayed as individual windows within a main window. Therefore, as

stated in the rejection recited above, <u>Hennum</u> in view of <u>Cooper</u> renders obvious the

invention as disclosed by applicant.

Conclusion

19.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

20.   A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

21.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard Pantoliano Jr whose telephone number is (571) 270-1049. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8am - 4 pm EST.

22.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571)272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

23.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RP
10/24/2007

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100